arXiv:1610.08697v1 [math.OC] 27 Oct 2016

INERTIAL PROXIMAL BEST APPROXIMATION PRIMAL-DUAL ALGORITHM

EWA M. BEDNARCZUK[1], ANNA JEZIERSKA[2], AND KRZYSZTOF E. RUTKOWSKI[3]

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. The proposed approach 4
3. The choice of C_n 7
4. Convergence analysis 9
5. Proximal algorithms 12
6. Experimental results 14
7. Conclusions 21

References 21

Abstract. We propose an enhanced primal-dual algorithm for solving inclusion problems involving maximally monotone operators. The main idea is to take into account previous approximates computed in prior steps in the formulas defining the projection algorithm of successive approximations of the set of solutions of primal and dual problems. To this end we consider projections onto intersections of halfspaces generated on the basis of the current as well as the previous approximates. The resulting memory/inertial algorithm inherits strong convergence properties of the original algorithm. Additionally, we provide the analysis of the speed of convergence in the form of the so called *inertial attraction property* defined below. An extensive experimental results on image reconstruction problems illustrate the memory/inertial effect of the proposed algorithm.

1. Introduction

Let H and G be two real Hilbert spaces and let $L : H \to G$ be a linear bounded operator. Let $A : H \to H$ and $B : G \to G$ be maximally monotone operators. Consider the problem of finding $p \in H$ such that

$$0 \in Ap + L^*BLp. \tag{P}$$

Different approaches to solve (P) have been proposed e.g. in [5, 22, 43]. In particular, primal-dual approaches may lead to formulations which can be represented as in (P) , see e.g. [2, 1, 10, 11, 13, 15, 19] and the references therein. Recently, the primal-dual

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47H05, 47J25, 65J20, 65J22, 49M27, 68Q25, 68U10, 90C25, 90C30, 94A08.

Key words and phrases. proximal algorithm with memory, inertial primal-dual algorithm, best approximation of the Kuhn-Tucker set, inclusions with maximally monotone operators, inertial attraction property, image reconstruction .

[1] System Research Institute, Warsaw University of Technology, e.bednarczuk@mini.pw.edu.pl.

[2] System Research Institute, Gdansk University of Technology http://www.ibspan.waw.pl/~jeziersk/ , Anna.Jezierska@ibspan.waw.pl .

[3] Warsaw University of Technology, k.rutkowski@mini.pw.edu.pl .

approach has been applied in [48] to a more general form of (P) involving the sum of two maximally monotone operators and a monotone operator. The case when A is maximal monotone and B is strongly monotone was considered in [43]. The overview of primal-dual approaches to solve (P) has been recently proposed in [28].

In majority of algorithms proposed in the references above the approximate x_{n+1} is defined on the basis of x_n only. Some inertial algorithms which rely on including x_{n-1} into the definition of x_{n+1} were proposed in [3, 4, 10, 15, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38]. They are mostly based on discretizations of the second order differential system related to the problem (P). This system, called *heavy ball with friction*, is exploited in order to accelerate convergence. Indeed, the introduction of the inertial term was shown to improve the speed of convergence significantly [27].

In [41] Pesquet and Pustelnik proposed a primal method with inertial effect introduced through inertia parameters. In contrast to the above mentioned contributions, the method explores information from more than one previous steps and allows finding zeros of the sum of an arbitrary number of maximally monotone operators (see also [22]).

For monotone inclusion problems inertial proximal algorithms and fixed-points iterations have been proposed in [3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 29, 35, 36, 43].

By applying to problem (P) the generalized Fenchel - Rockafellar duality framework [39, Corollary 2.12] (see also Corollary 2.4 of [40]) we obtain the dual inclusion problem which amounts to finding $v^* \in G$ such that

$$0 \in -LA^{-1}(-Lv^*) + B^{-1}v^*. \tag{D}$$

By [39, Corollary 2.12], a point $p \in H$ solves (P) if and only if $v^* \in G$ solves (D) and $(p, v^*) \in Z$, where

$$Z := \{(p, v^*) \in H \times G \mid -L^*v^* \in Ap \quad \text{and} \quad Lp \in B^{-1}v^*\}. \tag{1.1}$$

In the case when $L = Id$ and $H = G$, the set Z reduces to the *extended solution set* $S_e(A, B)$ as defined in [21]. The set Z is a closed convex subset of $H \times G$ (see e.g. [8, Proposition 23.39]).

One of the most important application of (P) is solving the optimization problem

$$\min_{p \in H} \quad f(p) + g(Lp), \tag{1.2}$$

where $f : H \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, $g : G \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ are proper convex lower semi-continuous functions and $L : H \to G$ is a bounded linear operator. Its Fenchel-Rockafellar dual problem takes the form (see [40])

$$\min_{v^* \in G} \; f^*(-L^*v^*) + g^*(v^*), \tag{1.3}$$

where f^* denotes the conjugate function [42]. In this case set Z is of the form

$$Z = \{(p, v^*) \in H \times G \mid -Lv^* \in \partial f(x) \text{ and } v^* \in \partial g(Lx)\}. \tag{1.4}$$

The approach via variational inequalities to solve (1.2)-(1.3) were proposed in [16, 17] (see also [20, 23]). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, $\theta : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ be a closed proper convex function, $F : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ be a monotone mapping. For the problem of finding $x^* \in \Omega$ such that

$$\theta(x) - \theta(x^*) + \langle x - x^* \mid F(x^*)\rangle \geq 0 \;\; \forall x \in \Omega$$

in [17] has the following iterative scheme has been proposed of finding $x_{n+1} \in \Omega$ such that

$$\bar{x}_n := x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1}),$$
$$f(x) - f(x_{n+1}) + \langle x - x_{n+1} \mid F(x_{n+1}) + \lambda_n^{-1} G(x_{n+1} - \bar{x}_n)\rangle \geq 0, \ \forall\, x \in \Omega,$$

where G is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix of order k and sequences $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 1}$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ satisfy suitable conditions.

For convex optimization problems of the form (1.2) inertial ADMM schemes have been considered in [9, 16]

Let $F: H \to H$ be a maximal monotone operator and $J_F(x) = (Id - F)^{-1}(x)$. The equivalence

$$J_{\lambda F}(x) = x \text{ if and only if } 0 \in Fx$$

leads to an iterative scheme for solving the fixed points problem of the form

$$x_{n+1} = T_n(x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1})), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\{\alpha_n\} \subset [0, 1)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular case when $T_n = J_{\lambda_n F}$ the iteration (1.5) was investigated in [3, 4, 17, 30].

1.1. **Fixed points methods.** For any mapping $T: H \to H$ we denote $\mathrm{Fix}\,(T)$ the set of fixed points of mapping T. The general Krasnoselskii-Mann iteration is

$$x_{n+1} = (1 - w_n)x_n + w_n T_n x_n,$$

where $\{w_n\} \subset (0, 2)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T_n: H \to H$ is a sequence of operators, with an associated solution set $S = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Fix}\,(T_n) \neq \emptyset$. The inertial extension of this iteration was investigated in [32] and takes the form: for $n \geq 1$

$$x_{n+1} = (1 - w_n)(x_n + \theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1})) + w_n T_n(x_n + \theta_n(x_n - x_{n-1})), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\{\theta_n\} \subset [0, 1]$, $\{w_n\} \subset (0, 2)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_0, x_1 \in H$. Under some assumptions on T_n authors show the weak convergence of iterate x_n to an element of S.

In [12] authors investigate the iterative scheme (1.6) with $T_n = T$, where T is an nonexpansive operator, i.e $\|Tx - Ty\| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in H$. They propose the following iterative scheme: for $n \geq 1$

$$x_{n+1} := (1 - \lambda_n)(x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1})) + \lambda_n[T(x_n + \alpha_n(x_n - x_{n-1}))],$$

with arbitrary $x_0, x_1 \in H$. For suitable choice of $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\geq 1}$, $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ the sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ converges weakly to a point in $\mathrm{Fix}\,T$.

For suitable choice of T one can obtain the iterative scheme for solving (P) and/or the primal dual pair (P)-(D) (see[13]).

1.2. **Projection methods.** The idea of finding a point from Z is based on the fact that

$$Z \subset \{(p, v^*) \in H \times G \mid \varphi(p, v^*) \leq 0\} := H_\varphi,$$

where $\varphi(p, v^*) := \langle p - a \mid a^* + L^* v^*\rangle + \langle b^* - v^* \mid Lp - b\rangle$, $(a, a^*) \in \mathrm{graph}A$, $(b, b^*) \in \mathrm{graph}B$. This fact suggests the following iterative scheme for finding a point from Z and based on projections onto H_φ: for any $(p_0, v_0^*) \in H \times G$ and relaxation parameters $\lambda_n \in (0, 2)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$(p_{n+1}, v_{n+1}^*) := (p_n, v_n) + \lambda_n(P_{H_n}(p_n, v_n^*) - (p_n, v_n^*)), \tag{1.7}$$

where $H_n := \{(p_n, v_n^*) \in H \times G \mid \varphi(p_n, v_n^*) \leq 0\}$ with φ_n defined for suitably chosen $(a_n, a_n^*) \in \text{graph}A$, $(b_n, b_n^*) \in \text{graph}B$ ([1, Proposition 2.3], see also [21, Lemma 3]) and $P_D(x)$ denotes the projection of x onto the set D. For $L = Id$ this iteration scheme has been proposed by Eckstein and Svaiter [21] and its fundamental convergence properties has been investigated in [21, Proposition 1, Proposition 2].

Further convergence properties of (1.7) have been investigated in [1] and [7, Theorem 2]. The sequence generated by (1.7) is Fejér monotone with respect to set Z and, in general, only its weak convergence is guaranteed.

Modifications of (1.7) to force strong convergence have been proposed in [2, 26, 46, 48, 49].

1.3. **The aim.** In the present paper we propose an inertial primal-dual projection algorithm to solve (P). The origin of our idea goes back to the algorithm of Haugazeau [8, Corollary 29.8] , who proposed an algorithm for finding the projection of $x_0 \in H$ onto the intersection of finite number of closed convex sets by using projections of x_0 onto intersections of two halfspaces. These halfspaces are defined on the basis of the current approximate x_n (see also [26, 46, 47]).

In our approach we take into account projections of x_0 onto intersections of three halfspaces which are defined on the basis of not only x_n but also x_{n-1}.

The contribution of the paper is as follows.

- We show through the algorithmic study the use of formulas for projections onto intersections of three half-spaces as derived in [45]. According to the best of our knowledge there do not exist other papers where such a technique is applied.
- We propose a number of inertial iterative schemes for solving primal-dual problems defined by (P) and (D).
- We apply our iterative schemes to propose a proximal inertial algorithm to solve minimization problem defined by a finite sum of convex functions.
- We provide convergence rate results of the proposed proximal inertial algorithm.
- We perform an experimental study aiming at comparing the best approximation algorithm proposed in [2] and our algorithm.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we propose the underlying inertial iterative schemes which are investigated in this paper. Section 3 provides the main results considering the proposed versions of inertial algorithms. One of the main ingredient is an explicit formula for projection of a given element onto the intersection of three given halfspaces derived in the paper [45]. In section 5 we cast our general framework to solving optimization problems of minimizing the sum of two convex, not necessarily differentiable, functions. In section 6 we present the results of the numerical experiment.

2. The proposed approach

In section 2.1 we recall generic Fejér Approximation Scheme for finding an element from the set Z defined by (1.1) and its basic properties. In section 2.2 we propose refinements of Fejér Approximation Scheme which are based on the idea proposed by Haugazeau [24], see also [8, Corollary]. The crucial issue of the proposed refinements is to improve the speed of convergence.

In the sequel, for any $x \in H \times G$ we write $x = (p, v^*)$, where $p \in H$ and $v^* \in G$.

2.1. **Successive Fejér Approximations iterative scheme.** Let H, G be real Hilbert spaces and let Z be defined by (1.1). Let $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset H \times G$, be a sequence of convex closed sets such that $Z \subset H_n,\ n \in \mathbb{N}$. The projections of any $x \in H$ onto H_n are uniquely defined.

Iterative Scheme 1 Generic Fejér Approximation Iterative Scheme

Choose an initial point $x_0 \in H \times G$
Choose a sequence of parameters $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in (0, 2)$
for $n = 0, 1 \dots$ **do**
$x_{n+1} = x_n + \lambda_n(P_{H_n}(x_n) - x_n)$
end for
return

Theorem 1. *(*[1, Proposition 3.1]*, see also* [18]*) For any sequence generated by Iterative Scheme 1 the following hold:*

(1) $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset H \times G$ *is Fejér monotone with respect to the set* Z*, i.e*

$$\forall_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\ \forall_{z\in Z}\ \|x_{n+1} - z\| \leq \|x_n - z\|,$$

(2) $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \lambda_n(2 - \lambda_n)\|P_{H_n}(x_n) - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$,

(3) if

$$\forall x \in H \times G\ \forall\{k_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N} \quad x_{k_n} \rightharpoonup x \implies x \in Z,$$

then $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *converges weakly to a point in* Z*.*

In [1] the sets H_n appearing in Iterative Scheme 1 are defined as closed halfspaces H_{a_n,b_n^*},

$$\begin{aligned} H_{a_n,b_n^*} &:= \left\{x \in H \times G \mid \left\langle x \mid s^*_{a_n,b_n^*}\right\rangle \leq \eta_{a_n,b_n^*}\right\}, \\ s^*_{a_n,b_n^*} &:= (a_n^* + L^*b_n^*, b_n - La_n), \\ \eta_{a_n,b_n^*} &:= \langle a_n \mid a_n^*\rangle + \langle b_n \mid b_n^*\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{*}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &:= J_{\gamma_n A}(p_n - \gamma_n L^* v_n^*), \quad b_n := J_{\mu_n B}(Lp_n + \mu_n v_n^*), \\ a_n^* &:= \gamma_n^{-1}(p_n - a_n) - L^*v_n^*, \quad b_n^* := \mu_n^{-1}(Lp_n - b_n) + v_n^* \end{aligned}$$

and $\mu_n, \gamma_n > 0$ are parameters suitable defined. It easy to see $H_{\varphi_n} = H_{a_n,b_n^*}$, where $\varphi_n = \varphi(a_n, b_n^*)$.

For $H_n = H_{a_n,b_n^*}$ Theorem 1 can be strengthened in following way.

Theorem 2. [1, Proposition 3.5] *For any sequence generated by Iterative Scheme 1 with* H_n *defined by* $(*)$ *the following hold:*

(1) $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} = \{(p_n, v_n^*)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is Fejér monotone with respect to the set* Z*,*

(2) $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|a_n^* + L^*b_n^*\|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|La_n - b_n\|^2 < +\infty$,

(3) $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|p_{n+1} - p_n|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*\|^2 < +\infty$,

(4) $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|p_n - a_n|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\sum\limits_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|v_n^* - b_n^*|^2 < +\infty$,

(5) $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *converges weakly to a point in* Z.

2.2. **Best approximation iterative schemes.** Here we study iterative best approximation schemes in the form of Iterative Scheme 2. For any $x, y \in H \times G$ we define

$$H(x,y) := \{h \in H \times G \mid \langle h - y \mid x - y\rangle \leq 0\}.$$

As previously, let $\{H_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset H \times G$ be a sequence of closed convex sets, $Z \subset H_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\{C_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of closed convex sets, $Z \subset C_n \subset H_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Iterative Scheme 2 Generic primal-dual best approximation iterative scheme

Choose an initial point $x_0 = (p_0, v_0^*) \in H \times G$
Choose a sequence of parameters $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in (0, 1]$
for $n = 0, 1 \ldots$ **do**
  Fejérian step
  $x_{n+1/2} = x_n + \lambda_n(P_{H_n}(x_n) - x_n)$
  Haugazeau step
  $x_{n+1} = P_{H(x_0,x_n)\cap C_n}(x_0)$
end for
return

The choice of $C_n = H_n = H_{a_n,b_n}$ has been already investigated in [2]. There it has been shown that this choice allows to achieve strong convergence of the constructed sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Our aim is to propose and investigate other choices of C_n. In particular, we introduce C_n defined with the help of not only $x_n,\ x_{n+1/2}$ but also $x_{n-1}, x_{n-1+1/2}$. This leads to iterative schemes which exploits not only current approximation but take into account also previous approximations, hence we obtain an iterative scheme with memory.

The Fejérian step in Iterative Scheme 2 coincides with what has been defined in Iterative Scheme 1 and was previously discussed in [1, 18].

Convergence properties of the sequences $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated according to Iterative Scheme 2 are summarized in Proposition 1. Most importantly the proposition bellow shows strong convergence under unrestrictive conditions [6, 46].

Proposition 1. *Let* Z *be a nonempty closed convex subset of* $H \times G$ *and let* $x_0 = (p_0, v_0^*) \in H \times G$. *Let* $\{C_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be any sequence satisfying* $Z \subset C_n \subset H_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *For the sequence* $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *generated by Iterative Scheme 2 the following hold:*

(1) $Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \cap C_n$ *for* $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(2) $\|x_{n+1} - x_0\| \geq \|x_n - x_0\|$ *for* $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(3) $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$,
(4) $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$.
(5) If

$$\forall x \in H \times G\ \forall \{k_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N} \quad x_{k_n} \rightharpoonup x \implies x \in Z,$$

then $x_n \to P_Z(x_0)$.

Proof. The proof follows the lines of the proof of Proposition 2.1 of [2]. The proof of assertion 5 coincides with the proof of 4 of Proposition 2.1 of [2] and is omitted here. We provide the proofs of assertions 1-4 for completeness.

(1) First we show that $Z \subset H(x_0, x_n)$. For $n = 0$, $x_1 = P_{H(x_0,x_0)\cap C_0}(x_0)$, so $Z \subset H(x_0, x_1)$. Furthermore, $H(x_0, x_n) \cap C_n \subset H(x_0, P_{H(x_0,x_n)\cap C_n}(x_0))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) &\implies Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \cap C_n \\ &\implies Z \subset H(x_0, P_{H(x_0,x_n)\cap C_n}(x_0)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow Z \subset H(x_0, x_{n+1}) \end{aligned}$$

(2) By construction, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{n+1} = P_{H(x_0,x_n)\cap C_n}(x_0)$ and $x_{n+1} \subset H(x_0, x_n)\cap C_n$, so $x_{n+1} \in H(x_0, x_n)$. This implies $\|x_n - x_0\| \leq \|x_{n+1} - x_0\|$.

(3) From the fact that $Z \subset H(x_0, x_n)$ we deduce $\|x_n - x_0\| \leq \|P_Z(x_0) - x_0\|$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, the sequence $\{\|x_n - x_0\|\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \|x_n - x_0\| \leq \|P_Z(x_0) - x_0\|.$$

Since $x_{n+1} \subset H(x_0, x_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 &\leq \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 + 2\langle x_{n+1} - x_n \mid x_n - x_0\rangle \\ &= \|x_{n+1} - x_0\|^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N} (\|x_{n+1} - x_0\|^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2) = \|x_{n+1} - x_0\|^2$$

and

$$\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 \leq \lim_{n\to+\infty} \|x_{n+1} - x_0\|^2 \leq \|P_Z(x_0) - x_0\| < +\infty.$$

(4) $C_n \subset H(x_n, P_{C_n}(x_n)) \subset H(x_n, x_n + \lambda_n(P_{C_n}(x_n) - x_n)) = H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$. Since $x_{n+1} \in C_n \subset H_n \subset H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 \leq x_{n+1} - x_{n+1/2}\|^2 + \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 \\ &\leq x_{n+1} - x_{n+1/2}\|^2 + 2\langle x_{n+1} - x_{n+1/2} \mid x_{n+1/2} - x_n\rangle + \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By 3., $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$, hence $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty$.

□

Remark 1. *Note that for $C_n = H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$ and $H_n = H_{a_n,b_n}$ we obtain the primal-dual best approximation algorithm introduced by Alotaibi et al. in* [2]*, involving projections onto the intersections of two halfspaces studied in* [8, Section 28.3].

3. The choice of C_n

One of the main contributions of the paper is to consider C_n which use the information from the previous step. In this way Iterative Scheme 2 becomes inertial in the sense that the construction of x_{n+1} depends not only on $x_{n+1/2}$, x_n, but also on $x_{n-1+1/2}$, x_{n-1}.

We start with the following propositions.

Proposition 2. *Let $x, u, v \in H$. Then $H(x, u) \cap H(x, v) \subset H(x, \tau u + (1 - \tau)v)$ for all $\tau \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. Let $h \in H(x,u) \cap H(x,v)$, i.e

$$\langle h-u \mid x-u\rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle h-v \mid x-v\rangle \leq 0.$$

For any $\tau \in [0,1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle h-\tau v-(1-\tau)w \mid x-\tau v-(1-\tau)w\rangle\\
&= \langle h \mid x\rangle - \tau\langle h \mid v\rangle - \tau\langle v \mid x\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle h \mid w\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle w \mid x\rangle\\
&+ \tau^2\langle v \mid v\rangle + (1-\tau)^2\langle w \mid w\rangle + 2\tau(1-\tau)\langle v \mid w\rangle\\
&= \tau\langle h \mid x\rangle - \tau\langle h \mid v\rangle - \tau\langle v \mid x\rangle + \tau\langle v \mid v\rangle\\
&+ (1-\tau)\langle h \mid x\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle h \mid w\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle w \mid x\rangle + (1-\tau)\langle w \mid w\rangle\\
&+ \tau^2\langle v \mid v\rangle + (1-\tau)^2\langle w \mid w\rangle + 2\tau(1-\tau)\langle v \mid w\rangle - \tau\langle v \mid v\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle w \mid w\rangle\\
&\leq \tau^2\langle v \mid v\rangle + (1-\tau)^2\langle w \mid w\rangle + 2\tau(1-\tau)\langle v \mid w\rangle - \tau\langle v \mid v\rangle - (1-\tau)\langle w \mid w\rangle\\
&= \tau(\tau-1)\langle v \mid v\rangle + (1-\tau)(-\tau)\langle w \mid w\rangle + 2\tau(1-\tau)\langle v \mid w\rangle\\
&\leq \tau(\tau-1)\|v\|^2 + (1-\tau)(-\tau)\|w\|^2 + 2\tau(1-\tau)\|v\|\|w\|\\
&= \tau(\tau-1)(\|v\|^2 - 2\|v\|\|w\| + \|w\|^2) = -\tau(1-\tau)(\|v\| + \|w\|)^2 \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $h \in H(x, \tau u + (1-\tau)v)$. □

Proposition 3. *For C_n defined as*

$$C_n := H(x_n, x_{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \cap H(x_{n-1}, x_{n-\frac{1}{2}}) \text{ for } n \geq 1 \text{ and } C_0 = H(x_0, x_{1/2}), \tag{3.1}$$

$$C_n := H(x_n, x_{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \cap H(x_0, x_{n-1}) \text{ for } n \geq 1 \text{ and } C_0 = H(x_0, x_{1/2}), \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_n :=& H(x_n, x_{n+\frac{1}{2}}) \cap H(x_0, \tau_n x_n + (1-\tau_n)x_{n-1})) \text{ for } \tau_n \in (0,1), n \geq 1\\ &\text{and } C_0 = H(x_0, x_{1/2}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

the assertions 1-5 of Proposition 1 holds.

Proof. To apply Proposition 1 we need only to show that C_n are closed and convex and $Z \subset C_n \subset H_n$. The sets C_n are closed and convex as intersections of finitely many closed halfspaces. By construction of $x_{n+1/2}$ we have $Z \subset H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(1) For C_n given by (3.1) we have $Z \subset H(x_n, x_{n+1/2}) \cap H(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1+1/2})$ since $Z \subset H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$.

(2) Let C_n be given by (3.2). By construction, $Z \subset H(x_0, x_{1/2}) = H(x_0, x_1) = C_0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose $Z \subset C_k = H(x_k, x_{k+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, x_{k-1})$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z \subset H(x_0, x_{n-1}) \cap H(x_{n-1}, x_{n-1+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, x_{n-2}) = C_n \cap H(x_0, x_{n-2})\\
&\implies Z \subset H(x_0, P_{C_n \cap H(x_0, x_{n-2})}(x_0))\\
&\Leftrightarrow Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \Leftrightarrow Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \cap H(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1+1/2}) = C_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By induction, $Z \subset C_n$ for all $n \geq 0$.

(3) Let C_n be given by (3.3). By construction, $Z \subset H(x_0, x_{1/2}) = H(x_0, x_1) = C_0$. By Proposition 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \cap H(x_0, x_{n-1})\\
&\implies Z \subset H(x_0, \tau_n x_n + (1-\tau_n)x_{n-1}) \text{ for all } \tau_n \in (0,1).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose $Z \subset C_k = H(x_k, x_{k+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, x_{k-1})$ and $Z \subset H(x_0, x_k)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&Z \subset C_n = H(x_n, x_{n+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, \tau_n x_n + (1-\tau_n)x_{n-1})) \\
&\implies Z \subset H(x_n, x_{n+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, \tau_n x_n + (1-\tau_n)x_{n-1})) \cap H(x_0, x_n) \\
&\implies Z \subset H(x_0, P_{H(x_0, H(x_n, x_{n+1/2}) \cap H(x_0, \tau_n x_n + (1-\tau_n)x_{n-1})) \cap H(x_0, x_n)}(x_0)) \\
&\Leftrightarrow Z \subset H(x_0, P_{C_n \cap H(x_0, x_n)}(x_0)) = H(x_0, x_{n+1}) \\
&\Leftrightarrow Z \subset H(x_0, x_n) \cap H(x_{n+1}) \implies Z \subset H(x_0, \tau_{n+1} x_{n+1} + (1-\tau_{n+1})x_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $Z \subset C_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

□

When $H_n := H_{a_n, b_n}$ $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where H_{a_n, b_n} are defined by (*), Proposition 1 takes the following form.

Proposition 4. *Let Z be a nonempty closed convex subset of $H \times G$ and let $x_0 = (p_0, v_0^*) \in H \times G$. Let $\{C_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be any of sequences defined by formulas (3.1)-(3.3) of Proposition 3 and $H_n := H_{a_n, b_n}$, $\in \mathbb{N}$. For any sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated by Iterative Scheme 2 the following hold:*

(1) $\|x_{n+1} - x_0\| \geq \|x_n - x_0\|$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
(2) $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|p_{n+1} - p_n\|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*\|^2 < +\infty$,
(3) $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|p_n - a_n\|^2 < +\infty$ *and* $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|Lp_n - b_n\|^2 < +\infty$,
(4) $p_n \to \bar{x}$, $v_n^* \to \bar{v}^*$ *and* $(\bar{p}, \bar{v}^*) \in Z$.

Proof.

(1) The statement follows directly from 2. of Proposition 1.
(2) By Proposition 1,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|p_{n+1} - p_n\|^2 + \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*\|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \|x_{n+1} - x_n\|^2 < +\infty.$$

(3) The proof is similar to the proof of [1, Proposition 3.5].
(4) The proof is similar to the proof of [1, Proposition 3.5].

□

4. Convergence analysis

In this section we convergence investigate properties of sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ constructed in Iterative Scheme 2.

We start with the following technical lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let U be a real Hilbert space and let $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in U$, $u_3 \in H(u_1, u_2)$, $w = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_3)$, $r := \|w - u_1\|$. Then*

(i) $\|w - u_2\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u_1 - u_3\|$,
(ii) $\|u_2 - u_3\|^2 \leq b(u_2)$, *where* $b(\cdot) := 4r^2 - \|\cdot - u_1\|^2$.
(iii) Moreover, if $u_4 \in H$ *and* $u_2 \in H(u_1, u_4)$, *then* $b(u_2) \leq b(u_4)$.

Proof.

(i) We have

$$\begin{aligned} r = \|w - u_1\| &= \|\frac{1}{2}u_1 + \frac{1}{2}u_3 - u_1\| = \frac{1}{2}\|u_3 - u_1\| \\ &= \|\frac{1}{2}u_1 + \frac{1}{2}u_3 - u_3\| = \|w - u_3\|. \end{aligned}$$

By contradiction, suppose $\|w - u_2\| > \frac{1}{2}\|u_1 - u_3\|$. Since $u_3 \in H(u_1, u_2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_3 - u_2\|^2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|^2 \\ &\quad = \|u_3 - u_2\|^2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|^2 + 2\langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_2 - u_1\rangle + 2\langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_1 - u_2\rangle \\ &\quad = \|u_3 - u_1\|^2 + 2\langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_1 - u_2\rangle \leq \|u_3 - u_1\|^2 = 4r^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} 4r^2 = \|u_3 - u_1\|^2 &\geq \|u_3 - u_2\|^2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|^2 \\ &= \|u_3 - w\|^2 - 2\langle u_3 - w \mid u_2 - w\rangle + \|u_2 - w\|^2 \\ &+ \|u_1 - w\|^2 - 2\langle u_1 - w \mid u_2 - w\rangle + \|u_2 - w\|^2 \\ &= 2r^2 + 2\|u_2 - w\|^2 - 2\langle u_3 + u_1 - 2w \mid u_2 - w\rangle > 4r^2, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

(ii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_3 - u_2\|^2 &= \langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_3 - u_2\rangle = \langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_1 - u_1 + u_3 - u_2\rangle \\ &= \langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_1 - u_2\rangle + \langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_3 - u_1\rangle \\ &\leq \langle u_3 - u_2 \mid u_3 - u_1\rangle = \langle u_3 - u_2 - u_1 + u_1 \mid u_3 - u_1\rangle \\ &= \langle u_3 - u_1 \mid u_3 - u_1\rangle + \langle u_1 - u_2 \mid u_3 - u_1\rangle \\ &= 4r^2 + \langle u_1 - u_2 \mid u_2 - u_2 + u_3 - u_1\rangle \\ &= 4r^2 + \langle u_1 - u_2 \mid u_2 - u_1\rangle + \langle u_1 - u_2 \mid u_3 - u_2\rangle \\ &\leq 4r^2 - \|u_1 - u_2\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) The assertion (iii) stems from the fact that $u_2 \in H(u_1, u_4)$ implies $\|u_1 - u_2\|^2 \geq \|u_1 - u_4\|^2$ and

$$\|u_3 - u_2\|^2 \leq \|u_1 - u_3\|^2 - \|u_1 - x_n\|^2 \leq \|u_1 - u_3\|^2 - \|u_1 - u_4\|^2.$$

□

We show that all the points x_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, generated by Iterative Scheme 2 are contained in the ball centred at $w := \frac{1}{2}(x_0 + \bar{x})$ with radius $r := \|w - x_0\| = \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{dist}\,(x_0, Z)$ and the distance from x_n to the solution $\bar{x}$ is bounded from above by a nonincreasing sequence.

Proposition 5. *Any sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated by Iterative Scheme 2 satisfies the following:*

(1) $\|w - x_n\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|x_0 - \bar{x}\|$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(2) $\|x_n - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq b_n$, *where* $b_n := 4r^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2 \geq 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(3) Moreover, if $x_n \in H(x_0, x_{n-1})$ for all $n \geq 1$, the sequence $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is nonincreasing. If for some $n \geq 1$ we have $x_{n-1} \neq x_n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{x} - x_n\|^2 < \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_0 - x_{n-1}\|^2, \\ &b_n < b_{n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $\bar{x} \in H(x_0, x_n)$. We obtain (1) and (2) by applying Lemma 1 with $u_1 = x_0$, $u_2 = x_n$ and $u_3 = \bar{x}$.

The assertion (3) follows from (iii) of Lemma 1 with $u_1 = x_0$, $u_2 = x_n$, $u_3 = \bar{x}$ and $u_4 = x_{n-1}$. Moreover, if for some $n \geq 1$ we have $x_{n-1} \neq x_n$, then $\|x_0 - x_n\|^2 > \|x_0 - x_{n-1}\|^2$, which follows from 2 of Proposition 1. □

Remark 2. *Let x_0, x_n, $x_{n+1/2}$, $\bar{x} \in H$, be such that $\bar{x} \in H(x_0, x_n)$ and $\bar{x} \in H(x_n, x_{n+1/2})$. Then*

$$\|x_{n+1/2} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2 - \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2.$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying (ii) of Lemma 1 to $u_1 = x_0$, $u_2 = x_n$, $u_3 = \bar{x}$

$$\|x_n - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2. \tag{4.2}$$

Applying again (ii) of Lemma 1 to $u_1 = x_n$, $u_2 = x_{n+1/2}, u_3 = \bar{x}$ we obtain

$$\|x_{n+1/2} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2. \tag{4.3}$$

In consequence, we have $\|x_{n+1/2} - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x_n - \bar{x}\|$. Combining (4.2) and (4.3) we obtain

$$\|x_{n+1/2} - \bar{x}\|^2 \leq \|x_n - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2 \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_n - x_0\|^2 - \|x_{n+1/2} - x_n\|^2.$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let U be a real Hilbert space and let $D \subset U$ be a nonempty subset of U. Let $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 \in U$ and $u_3 \in H(u_1, u_2) \cap H(u_2, u_4) \cap D$, $w = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 + u_3)$, $r := \|w - u_1\|$.*

Let $\bar{q} \in H(u_1, u_2) \cap H(u_2, u_4) \cap D$. Then $\bar{q} \in H(u_1, q)$, where $q = Q(u_1, u_2, u_4) := P_{H(u_1,u_2)\cap H(u_2,u_4)}(u_1)$ and

$$\|u_1 - \bar{q}\|^2 \geq \|u_1 - q\|^2 + \|\bar{q} - q\|^2,$$
$$\|u_3 - \bar{q}\|^2 \leq 4r^2 - \|u_1 - \bar{q}\|^2 \leq 4r^2 - \|u_1 - q\|^2 - \|\bar{q} - q\|^2.$$

Proof. It is immediate that $\bar{q} \in H(u_1, q)$. Thus

$$\|u_1 - \bar{q}\| = \|u_1 - q\|^2 + 2\langle u_1 - q \mid q - \bar{q}\rangle + \|\bar{q} - q\|^2 \geq \|u_1 - q\|^2 + \|\bar{q} - q\|^2.$$

By Lemma 1, since $u_3 \in H(u_1, \bar{q})$, we have $\|u_3 - \bar{q}\| \leq 4r^2 - \|u_1 - \bar{q}\|^2$ which completes the proof. □

Proposition 6. *[Inertial attraction property] Sequences $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{x_{n+1/2}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ generated by Iterative Scheme 2 satisfy the following:*

(i) $\|x_0 - x_n\|^2 \geq \|x_0 - q_n\|^2 + \|x_n - q_n\|^2$,
(ii) $\|\bar{x} - x_n\|^2 \leq \|x_0 - \bar{x}\|^2 - \|x_0 - q_n\|^2 - \|x_n - q_n\|^2$,

where $q_n := P_{H(x_0,x_{n-1})\cap H(x_{n-1},x_{n-1+1/2})}(x_0)$ and $\bar{x} = P_Z(x_0)$.

Proof. The proof follows directly from Lemma 2 with $u_1 = x_0$, $u_2 = x_n$, $u_3 = \bar{x}$, $u_4 = x_{n+1/2}$ and $D = C_n$. □

5. Proximal algorithms

Let H and G be real Hilbert spaces, let $f: H \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ and $g: G \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ be proper lower semicontinuous convex functions and let $L: H \to G$ be a bounded linear operator. Iterative Scheme 3 defined bellow is an application of Iterative Scheme 2 to optimization problem (1.2)-(1.3), i.e. we consider the pair of problems,

$$\min_{p\in H} F_P(p) := f(p) + g(Lp) \tag{5.1}$$

and the dual problem to (5.1),

$$\min_{v^*\in G} F_D(v^*) := f^*(-L^*v^*) + g^*(v^*). \tag{5.2}$$

If (5.1) has a solution $\bar{p} \in H$ and the regularity condition holds, e.g.

$$0 \in \text{sqri}(\text{dom}g - L(\text{dom}F)),$$

where for any convex closed set S

$$\text{sqri}S := \{x \in S \mid \bigcup_{\lambda>0} \lambda(S-x) \text{ is a closed linear subspace of } H\},$$

there exists $\bar{v}^* \in G$ solving (5.2) and

$$(\bar{p}, \bar{v}^*) \in Z = \{(p, v^*) \in H \times G \mid -Lv^* \in \partial f(x) \text{ and } v^* \in \partial g(Lx)\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Conversely, if $(\bar{p}, \bar{v}^*) \in Z$, then $\bar{p}$ solves (5.1) and $\bar{v}^*$ solves (5.2).

The set Z defined by (5.3) is of the form (1.1), when $A = \partial f$ and $B = \partial g$.

Recall that for any $x \in H$ and any proper convex and lower semi-continuous function $f: H \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ the *proximity operator* $\text{Prox}_f(x)$ is defined as the unique solution to the optimization problem

$$\min_{y\in H} \left(f(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|x-y\|^2 \right).$$

Theorem 3. [8, Example 23.3] *Let $f: H \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a proper convex lower semi-continuous function, $x \in H$ and $\gamma > 0$. Then*

$$J_{\gamma\partial f}(x) = \textit{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x),$$

where $J_A(x) = (Id - A)^{-1}(x)$.

Convergence properties of Iterative Scheme 3 are summarized in Proposition 4.

5.1. **Generalization to finite number of functions.** Let M and K be natural numbers. Let $\mathbf{E} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^M H_i \times \bigoplus_{k=1}^K G_k$, where H_i, G_k are real Hilbert spaces, $i = 1, \dots, M$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. Let $f_i: H_i \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $g_k: G_i \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be proper lower semicontinuous convex functions and $L_{ik}: H_i \to G_k$ be bounded linear operators , $i = 1, \dots, M$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. Consider the primal problem

$$\min_{p_1\in H_1, \dots, p_M \in H_M} \sum_{i=1}^M f_i(p_i) + \sum_{k=1}^K g_k\left(\sum_{i=1}^M L_{ik}p_i\right). \tag{5.4}$$

Problem formulation (5.4) is general enough to cover problem arising in diverse applications including signal and image reconstruction, compressed sensing and machine learning [25]. The dual problem to (5.4) is

$$\min_{v_1^*\in G_1, \dots, v_K^* \in G_K} \sum_{i=1}^M f_i^*\left(-\sum_{k=1}^K L_{ki}^* v_k^*\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K g_k^*(v_k^*). \tag{5.5}$$

Iterative Scheme 3 Proximal primal-dual best approximation iterative scheme

Choose an initial point $x_0 = (p_0, v_0^*) \in H \times G$ and $\varepsilon > 0$
Choose sequences of parameters $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in (0,1]$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n\geq 0}, \{\mu_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]$

for $n = 0, 1 \dots$ **do**
  $a_n = \mathsf{Prox}_{\gamma_n f}(p_n - \gamma_n L^* v_n^*)$
  $b_n = \mathsf{Prox}_{\mu_n g}(Lp_n + \mu_n v_n^*)$
  $a_n^* = \gamma_n^{-1}(p_n - a_n) - L^* v_n^*$
  $b_n^* = \mu_n^{-1}(Lp_n - b_n) + v_n^*$
  $s_n^* = (a_n^* + L^* b_n^*, b_n - La_n)$
  $\eta_n = \langle a_n \mid a_n^* \rangle + \langle b_n \mid b_n^* \rangle$
  $H_n = \left\{ x \in H \times G \mid \left\langle x \mid s^*_{a_n, b_n} \right\rangle \leq \eta_{a_n, b_n} \right\}$
  if $\|s_n^*\| = 0$ **then**
    $\bar{x} = x_n$, $\bar{v}^* = v_n^*$
    Terminate
  else
    Fejérian step
    $x_{n+1/2} = x_n + \lambda_n (P_{H_n}(x_n) - x_n)$
    Haugazeau step
    Choose C_n according to Proposition 3
    $x_{n+1} = P_{H(x_0, x_n) \cap C_n}(x_0)$
  end if
end for
return

Assume that

$$(\forall i \in \{1, \dots, M\}) \quad 0 \in \mathsf{ran} \left(\partial f_i + \sum_{k=1}^{K} L_{ki}^* \circ \partial g_k \circ L_{ik} \right),$$

where ran$D$ denotes the range of an operator D. Then the set

$$Z := \Bigg\{ (p_1, \dots, p_M, v_1^*, \dots, v_K^*) \in \mathbf{E} \mid -\sum_{k=1}^{K} L_{ki}^* v_k^* \in \partial f_i(p_i), \sum_{i=1}^{M} L_{ik} p_i \in \partial g_k^*(v_k^*), \\ i = 1 \dots, M,\ k = 1, \dots, K \Bigg\} \tag{5.6}$$

is nonempyty and if $(\bar{p}_1, \dots, \bar{p}_M, \bar{v}_1^*, \dots, \bar{v}_K^*) \in Z$ then $(\bar{p}_1, \dots, \bar{p}_M)$ solves (5.4) and $(\bar{v}_1^*, \dots, \bar{v}_K^*)$ solves (5.5). To find an element of set Z defined by (5.6) we propose the following iterative scheme.

Iterative Scheme 4 Proximal primal-dual best approximation iterative scheme for finite number of functions

Choose an initial point $x_0 = (p_0, v_0^*) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^M H_i \times \bigoplus_{k=1}^K G_k$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,
$p_0 = (p_{1,0}, \ldots, p_{M,0})$, $v_0^* = (v_{1,0}^*, \ldots, v_{K,0}^*)$
Choose sequences of parameters $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in (0,1]$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n\geq 0}, \{\mu_n\}_{n\geq 0} \in [\varepsilon, 1/\varepsilon]$

for $n = 0, 1 \ldots$ **do**
  Fejerian step
  for $i = 1, \ldots, M$ **do**
    $a_{i,n} = \mathsf{Prox}_{\gamma_n f_i}(p_{i,n} - \gamma_n \sum_{k=1}^K L_{ki}^* v_{k,n}^*)$
    $a_{i,n}^* = \gamma_n^{-1}(p_{i,n} - a_{i,n}) - \sum_{k=1}^K L_{ki}^* v_{k,n}^*$
  end for
  for $k = 1, \ldots, K$ **do**
    $b_{k,n} = \mathsf{Prox}_{\mu_n g_k}(\sum_{i=1}^M L_{ik} p_{i,n} + \mu_n v_{k,n}^*)$
    $b_{k,n}^* = \mu_n^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^M L_{ik} p_{i,n} - b_{k,n}) + v_{k,n}^*$
    $s_{M+k,n}^* = b_{k,n} - \sum_{i=1}^M L_{ik} a_{i,n}$
  end for
  for $i = 1, \ldots, M$ **do**
    $s_{i,n}^* = a_{i,n}^* + \sum_{k=1}^K L_{ki}^* b_{k,n}^*$
  end for
  $s_n^* = (s_{1,n}^*, \ldots, s_{M,n}^*, s_{M+1,n}^*, \ldots, s_{M+K,n}^*)$
  $\eta_n = \sum_{i=1}^M \langle a_{i,n} \mid a_{i,n}^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^K \langle b_{k,n} \mid b_{k,n}^* \rangle$
  $H_n = \{h \in \mathbf{E} \mid \langle h \mid s_n^* \rangle \leq \eta_n\}$
  if $\|s_n^*\| = 0$ **then**
    $\bar{p} = p_n$, $\bar{v}^* = v_n^*$
    Terminate
  else
    $x_{n+1/2} = x_n + \lambda_n(P_{H_n}(x_n) - x_n)$
    Haugazeau step
    Choose C_n according to Proposition 3
    $x_{n+1} = P_{H(x_0, x_n) \cap C_n}(x_0)$
  end if
end for
return

Let us note that Proposition 4 can be easily generalized to cover also the case of the set Z defined by (5.6).

6. Experimental results

The aim of this section is to illustrate and analyze the performance of the proposed Iterative Scheme 4 in solving problem (5.4). We provide numerical results related to simple convex image inpaiting problem The considered problem can be rewritten as an instance of (5.4) by setting $M = 1$, $K = 2$, $H = \mathbb{R}^{3D}$ and finding $\min_{p\in H} \quad f_1(p) + \sum_{k=1}^2 g_k(L_k p)$, where functions f_1, g_1 and g_2 correspond to positivity constraint, data fidelity term and total variation (TV) based regularization [44], respectively. We focus on the analysis of influence of the choice of C_n on the convergence. To this end we

report the number of iterations of the algorithm with different C_n settings performed to reach a tolerance $\|p^{(n+1)} - p^{(n)}\| / \left(1 + \|p^{(n)}\|\right)$ less than ϵ in two successive iterations. The considered algorithms are denoted hereafter by PDBA-C0, PDBA-C1, PDBA-C2, PDBA-C3, for non-inertial C_n, inertial C_n defined by (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3), respectively. In the case of PDBA-C3 τ_n is set to 0.5. Numerically, the convergence rate improvement is measured by ItR defined as a ratio of the numbers of iterations consumed by PDBA-Ci (where i takes value 0,1,2,3) and those consumed by PDBA-C0. The algorithms performance is illustrated by the following curves: (a) primal dual-gap, (b) signal to noise ratio (SNR) and (c) the bounds given by Proposition 5 as a functions of iteration number.

The evaluation experiments concern the image inpainting problem which corresponds to the recovery of an image $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{3D}$ from lossy observations $y = L_1\bar{p}$, where $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{3D\times 3D}$ is a diagonal matrix such that for $i = 1, \ldots, D$ we have $L_1(i,i) = L_1(2i,2i) = L_1(3i,3i) = 0$, if the pixel i in the observation image y is lost and $L_1(i,i) = L_1(2i,2i) = L_1(3i,3i) = 1$, otherwise. The considered optimization problem is of the form

$$\min_{p\in H} \quad \iota_y(L_1 p) + \iota_{\mathcal{S}}(p) + TV(p) \tag{6.1}$$

where ι is the indicator function defined as:

$$\iota_{\mathcal{S}}(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad p \in \mathcal{S} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

$TV : \mathbb{R}^{3D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a discrete isotropic total variation functional [44], i.e. for every $p \in \mathbb{R}^{3D}$, $TV(p) = g(L_2 p) := \omega \left(\sum_{d=1}^{D} ([\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} p]_d)^2 + ([\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} p]_d)^2\right)^{1/2}$ with $L_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{6D\times 3D}, L_2 := \left[(\Delta^{\mathrm{h}})^\top \ (\Delta^{\mathrm{v}})^\top\right]^\top$, where $\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3D\times 3D}$ (resp. $\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3D\times 3D}$) corresponds to a horizontal (resp. vertical) gradient operator,

$$[\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} p]_d := [(\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} p)_d, (\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} p)_{2d}, (\Delta^{\mathrm{h}} p)_{3d}] \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$
$$[\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} p]_d := [(\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} p)_d, (\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} p)_{2d}, (\Delta^{\mathrm{v}} p)_{3d}] \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

and ω denotes regularization parameter . The function $\iota_{\mathcal{S}}(p)$ is imposing the solution to belong to the set $\mathcal{S} = [0,1]^{3D}$. The dual problem to (6.1) is the following optimization problem [14, Example 3.24, 3.26, 3.27]:

$$\min_{v_1\in G_1,\ v_2\in G_2} \quad \langle y \mid v_1\rangle + \sup_{r\in S} \langle r \mid -L_1^* v_1 - L_2^* v_2\rangle + TV^*(v_2) \tag{6.3}$$

where $TV^*(v_2) = \omega\iota_B(\frac{v_2}{\omega})$, convex set $B = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{3D} : \|[p]_d\|_2 \leq 1,\ d = 1, \ldots, D\}$, $G_1 = \mathbb{R}^{3D}$, $G_2 = \mathbb{R}^{6D}$. In the following experiments, we consider the cases of lossy observations with κ randomly chosen pixels which are unknown. In the following we examine the cases of κ set to 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, 90% (hereafter $\tilde{\kappa}$ denotes a fraction of missing pixels). For all the algorithms we used the initialization $x_0 = [y, L_1 y, L_2 y]^T$. The test were performed on image `fruits` from public domain (source: `www.hlevkin.com/TestImages`) of size $D = 240 \times 256$.

$\kappa =$**20**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.40**	1.02	1.02
SNR	24.19	24.25	24.18	24.19
TV	40.66	40.37	40.68	40.67
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004

$\kappa =$ **40**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.51**	0.98	1.02
SNR	20.64	20.60	20.64	20.64
TV	36.06	36.04	36.05	36.07
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002

$\kappa =$ **60**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.44**	1.01	0.36
SNR	18.26	18.28	18.26	17.90
TV	30.87	30.55	30.87	30.80
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

$\kappa =$ **80**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.49**	0.89	0.99
SNR	16.17	16.18	16.18	16.17
TV	23.79	23.50	23.74	23.79
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

$\kappa =$ **90**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.51**	1.08	0.99
SNR	14.71	14.62	14.70	14.71
TV	18.87	18.13	18.94	18.87
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

TABLE 1. Reconstruction results from incomplete data with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, $\lambda_n = 1$, $\gamma_n = 0.005$, $\mu_n = 0.005$.

$\kappa =$**20**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.44**	1	1
SNR	24.02	24.13	24.02	24.02
TV	40.06	39.66	40.06	40.06
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005

$\kappa =$ **40**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.54**	1.02	1.03
SNR	20.52	20.56	20.51	20.53
TV	35.62	35.34	35.67	35.61
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004

$\kappa =$ **60**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.52**	1.04	0.91
SNR	18.24	18.25	18.22	18.23
TV	30.19	29.97	30.37	30.17
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003

$\kappa =$ **80**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.59**	1.21	1.02
SNR	16.15	16.16	16.15	16.15
TV	23.29	22.92	23.48	23.3202
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

$\kappa =$ **90**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.71**	1.52	0.59
SNR	14.67	14.65	14.65	14.33
TV	18.11	17.87	18.62	16.01
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002

TABLE 2. Reconstruction results from incomplete data with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, $\lambda_n = 1$, $\gamma_n = 0.01$, $\mu_n = 0.01$.

$\kappa =$**20**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.75**	1	1
SNR	23.00	23.03	23.00	23.00
TV	34.91	34.99	34.91	34.91
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011

$\kappa =$ **40**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.70**	1.02	1.03
SNR	20.01	20.00	20.01	20.01
TV	31.19	31.17	31.19	31.19
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.008	0.009	0.008	0.008

$\kappa =$ **60**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.69**	0.99	1.00
SNR	17.90	17.89	17.89	17.89
TV	26.60	26.63	26.59	26.59
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006

$\kappa =$ **80**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.73**	1	1.02
SNR	15.87	15.87	15.87	15.87
TV	20.46	20.52	20.48	20.49
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004

$\kappa =$ **90**%	PDBA-C0	PDBA-C1	PDBA-C2	PDBA-C3
ItR	1	**0.74**	0.95	1.02
SNR	14.33	14.35	14.31	14.33
TV	15.99	16.24	15.79	16.01
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002

TABLE 3. Reconstruction results from incomplete data with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, $\lambda_n = 1$, $\gamma_n = 1.5$, $\mu_n = 1.5$.

In our first experiment, we study the influence of the choice of C_n for different settings of γ_n, μ_n and λ_n, which play a significant role in convergence analysis.

The results summarized in Tables 1,2, 3, correspond to the choice of $\gamma_n = \mu_n$ equal to 0.005, 0.01 and 1.5, respectively. These results show that independently of the choice of parameters γ_n, μ_n algorithm PDBA-C1 leads to the best performance, while the results obtained with PDBA-C2 and PDBA-C3 are comparable to PDBA-C0. Specifically, within our setting the numbers of iterations consumed by PDBA-C1 range from 40% to 75% of those consumed by PDBA-C0, while the SNR, values of TV and inpainting residues are negligible. By inspecting Tables 1,2, 3, one can observe that the obtained results depend strongly upon to the choice of γ_n and μ_n.

We would like to emphasize that ideally the termination tolerance should be a function of parameters γ_n , μ_n and λ_n. The results presented in Table 4 shows that in the case of γ_n and μ_n equal to 0.003 or 100 the tolerance should be smaller to prevent premature termination. In these cases the iteration number is very low, however the values of TV and SNR are significantly different than for the other choices. The premature termination is due too flat slope of the convergence curve. Similar effect can be observed when $\lambda_n = 0.8$ (see Table 5).

PDBA-C0

γ_n, μ_n	0.003	0.005	0.01	1.5	100
SNR	7.28	24.19	24.02	23.00	7.64
TV	130.29	40.66	40.06	34.91	120.99
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.011	0.008
It No.	2	7543	6382	2883	5032

PDBA-C1

γ_n, μ_n	0.003	0.005	0.01	1.5	100
SNR	7.28	24.25	24.13	23.03	7.55
TV	130.29	40.37	39.66	34.99	122.89
$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.011	0.007
ItR	1	0.40	0.44	0.75	0.83

TABLE 4. Reconstruction results from incomplete coefficients with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, $\kappa = 20\%$.

In the second experiment, we compare the two PDBA-C0 and PDBA-C1 by presenting reconstruction results as well as supplying convergence curves, i.e. value of primal-dual gap, SNR and bound as a function of iterations. One can observe that PDBA-C1 leads to a faster convergence. The difference is the most important in the early stage of the iterations. Both algorithms slow down afterwards. For $\gamma_n = 0.01$ (resp. $\mu_n = 0.01$) both versions of the algorithm lead to some numerical oscillations in convergence, which are no more visible for settings $\gamma_n = 0.003$ (resp. $\mu_n = 0.003$).

(a) Original



(b) Degraded

(c) Ours result



(d) Primal-dual gap ($\gamma_n = 0.01$, $\mu_n = 0.01$)



(e) SNR ($\gamma_n = 0.01$, $\mu_n = 0.01$)



(f) Bounds ($\gamma_n = 0.01$, $\mu_n = 0.01$)



(g) Primal-dual gap ($\gamma_n = 0.003$, $\mu_n = 0.003$)



(h) SNR ($\gamma_n = 0.003$, $\mu_n = 0.003$)



(i) Bounds ($\gamma_n = 0.003$, $\mu_n = 0.003$)

FIGURE 6.1. Figure (a) shows the 240×256 clean fruits image, (b) shows the same image for which 80% randomly chosen missing pixels, and (c) shows the solution generated by Algorithm 4 PDBA-C1 after 3000 iterations, (d-f) and (g-i) show primal-dual gap, SNR, attraction property values (i.e $-\|(p_0, v_0^*) - (p_n, v_n^*)\|$) versus iterations, respectively. Algorithm PDBA-C0 and PDBA-C1 are denoted in green and blue, respectively.

	PDBA-C0				PDBA-C1			
λ_n	SNR0	TV	$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	It0	SNR1	TV	$\frac{\|y-L_1p\|_1}{(1-\tilde{\kappa})3D}$	$\frac{It1}{It0}$
1	24.19	40.66	0.004	7543	24.25	40.37	0.004	**0.40**
0.95	24.32	40.36	0.003	5149	24.25	40.33	0.004	**0.56**
0.9	24.24	40.37	0.004	4584	24.26	40.26	0.004	**0.57**
0.8	7.30	129.24	0.005	2	7.30	129.24	0.005	**1**

TABLE 5. Reconstruction results from incomplete coefficients with $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, $\kappa = 20\%$, $\gamma_n = 0.005$, $\mu_n = 0.005$.

7. Conclusions

We have proposed a new inertial primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving a general class of monotone inclusion problems involving parallel sum of maximally monotone operators composed with linear operators. The strong convergence of the algorithm as well as the inertial attraction property has been proved. The advantage of the algorithm is that it uses the resolvent of each operator separately and its parameters do not depend on the norm of the linear operators. Another strong point of this algorithm is that it does not require any matrix inversion to be performed. When applied to systems of monotone inclusions as well as composite convex minimization problems, this algorithm leads to new variants that feature the parallel computation by exploiting the separable structures of problems. Our experimental results related to preliminary implementation of the algorithms have shown that the proposed inertial algorithm is generally faster than the corresponding original one [2]. Although only three strategies of introducing memory effect were analysed in this work, the generality of the presented theoretical results allow us to address versatility of the approach by constructing various forms of the algorithm which use information from former steps. In the present work, we have shown experimentally that PDBA-C1 is the best over the considered strategies.

References

[1] A. Alotaibi, P. L. Combettes, and N. Shahzad. Solving coupled composite monotone inclusions by successive Fejér approximations of their Kuhn-Tucker set. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 24(4):2076–2095, 2014.

[2] A. Alotaibi, P.L. Combettes, and N. Shahzad. Best approximation from the Kuhn-Tucker set of composite monotone inclusions. *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization*, 36(12):1513–1532, 2015.

[3] F. Alvarez. Weak convergence of a relaxed and inertial hybrid projection-proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators in Hilbert space. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 14(3):773–782 (electronic), 2004.

[4] F. Alvarez and H. Attouch. An inertial proximal method for maximal monotone operators via discretization of a nonlinear oscillator with damping. *Set-Valued Analysis*, 9(1):3–11, 2001.

[5] H. Attouch, L.M. Briceno-Arias, and P.L. Combettes. A parallel splitting method for coupled monotone inclusions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48(5):3246–3270, 2010.

[6] H. H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes. A Weak-to-Strong Convergence Principle for Fejér-Monotone Methods in Hilbert Spaces. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 26(2):248–264, 2001.

[7] H.H. Bauschke. A note on the paper by Eckstein and Svaiter on "general projective splitting methods for sums of maximal monotone operators". *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48(4):2513–2515, 2009.

[8] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes. *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces (CMS Books in Mathematics)*. Springer, 2011.
[9] R. I. Boţ and E. R. Csetnek. An inertial alternating direction method of multipliers. *Minimax Theory Appl.*, 1(1):29–49, 2016.
[10] R. I. Boţ and E. R. Csetnek. An inertial forward-backward-forward primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving monotone inclusion problems. *Numerical Algorithms*, 71(3):519–540, 2016.
[11] R. I. Boţ, E. R. Csetnek, A. Heinrich, and C. Hendrich. On the convergence rate improvement of a primal-dual splitting algorithm for solving monotone inclusion problems. *Math. Program.*, 150(2):251–279, 2015.
[12] R. I. Boţ, E. R. Csetnek, and C. Hendrich. Inertial Douglas-Rachford splitting for monotone inclusion problems. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 256:472–487, 2015.
[13] R.I. Boţ and C. Hendrich. A Douglas-Rachford type primal-dual method for solving inclusions with mixtures of composite and parallel-sum type monotone operators. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(4):2541–2565, 2013.
[14] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2004.
[15] A. Chambolle and T. Pock. On the ergodic convergence rates of a first-order primal–dual algorithm. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–35, 2015.
[16] C. Chen, R. H. Chan, S. Ma, and J. Yang. Inertial proximal ADMM for linearly constrained separable convex optimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(4):2239–2267, 2015.
[17] C. Chen, S. Ma, and J. Yang. A general inertial proximal point algorithm for mixed variational inequality problem. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(4):2120–2142, 2015.
[18] P. L. Combettes. *Encyclopedia of Optimization*, chapter Fejér monotonicity in convex optimization, pages 1016–1024. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2009.
[19] P. L. Combettes and J. C. Pesquet. Primal-Dual Splitting Algorithm for Solving Inclusions with Mixtures of Composite, Lipschitzian, and Parallel-Sum Type Monotone Operators. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 20(2):307–330, 2012.
[20] J. Eckstein and D. P. Bertsekas. On the Douglas—Rachford splitting method and the proximal point algorithm for maximal monotone operators. *Mathematical Programming*, 55(1):293–318, 1992.
[21] J. Eckstein and B. F. Svaiter. A family of projective splitting methods for the sum of two maximal monotone operators. *Mathematical Programming*, 111(1):173–199, 2008.
[22] J. Eckstein and B. F. Svaiter. General projective splitting methods for sums of maximal monotone operators. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 48(2):787–811, 2009.
[23] D. Gabay. Chapter {IX} applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities. In Michel Fortin and Roland Glowinski, editors, *Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Numerical Solution of Boundary-Value Problems*, volume 15 of *Studies in Mathematics and Its Applications*, pages 299 – 331. Elsevier, 1983.
[24] Y. Haugazeau. *Sur les Inequations Variationnelles et la Minimisation de Fonctionnelles Convexes*. PhD thesis, Universite de Paris, 1968.
[25] C. Hendrich. *Proximal Splitting Methods in Nonsmooth Convex Optimization*. PhD thesis, technische Universitat Chemnitz, 2014.
[26] Guo ji Tang and Nan jing Huang. Strong convergence of a splitting proximal projection method for the sum of two maximal monotone operators. *Operations Research Letters*, 40(5):332 – 336, 2012.
[27] F. Jules and P. E. Maingé. Numerical approach to a stationary solution of a second order dissipative dynamical system. *Optimization*, 51(2):235–255, 2002.
[28] N. Komodakis and J. C. Pesquet. Playing with duality: An overview of recent primal-dual approaches for solving large-scale optimization problems. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 32(6):31–54, Nov 2015.
[29] D. A. Lorenz and T. Pock. An inertial forward-backward algorithm for monotone inclusions. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 51(2):311–325, 2015.
[30] P.-E. Maingé. Inertial iterative process for fixed points of certain quasi-nonexpansive mappings. *Set-Valued Anal.*, 15(1):67–79, 2007.
[31] P.-E. Mainge. Convergence theorems for inertial KM-type algorithms. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 219(1):223 – 236, 2008.
[32] P.-E. Maingé. Convergence theorems for inertial KM-type algorithms. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 219(1):223–236, 2008.

[33] P.-E. Maingé. Regularized and inertial algorithms for common fixed points of nonlinear operators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 344(2):876–887, 2008.
[34] A. Moudafi. A hybrid inertial projection-proximal method for variational inequalities. *JIPAM. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 5(3):Article 63, 5, 2004.
[35] A. Moudafi and E. Elisabeth. An approximate inertial proximal method using the enlargement of a maximal monotone operator. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 5(3):283–299, 2003.
[36] A. Moudafi and M. Oliny. Convergence of a splitting inertial proximal method for monotone operators. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 155(2):447 – 454, 2003.
[37] P. Ochs, T. Brox, and T. Pock. iPiasco: Inertial Proximal Algorithm for Strongly Convex Optimization. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, 53(2):171–181, 2015.
[38] P. Ochs, Y. Chen, T. Brox, and T. Pock. iPiano: Inertial Proximal Algorithm for Nonconvex Optimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 7(2):1388–1419, 2014.
[39] T. Pennanen. *Dualization of monotone generalized equations*. PhD thesis, University of Washington, 1999.
[40] T. Pennanen. Dualization of generalized equations of maximal monotone type. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 10(3):809–835, 2000.
[41] J.-C. Pesquet and N. Pustelnik. A parallel inertial proximal optimization method. *Pac. J. Optim.*, 8(2):273–306, 2012.
[42] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*, volume 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J, 1970.
[43] L. Rosasco, S. Villa, and B.C. Vũ. A stochastic inertial forward backward splitting algorithm for multivariate monotone inclusions. *Optimization*, 65(6):1293–1314, 2016.
[44] L I Rudin, S Osher, and E Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 60(1-4):259–268, 1992.
[45] K. E. Rutkowski. Explicit formulas for projections onto intersection of a finite number of halfspaces in Hilbert spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2016.
[46] M.V. Solodov and B.F. Svaiter. Forcing strong convergence of proximal point iterations in a Hilbert space. *Mathematical Programming*, 87(1):189–202.
[47] Guo-ji Tang and Fu-quan Xia. Strong convergence of a splitting projection method for the sum of maximal monotone operators. *Optimization Letters*, 8(4):1313–1324, 2014.
[48] Q. Tran-Dinh and B. Cong Vu. A new splitting method for solving composite monotone inclusions involving parallel-sum operators. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2015.
[49] Y. J. Wang, N. H. Xiu, and J. Z. Zhang. Modified extragradient method for variational inequalities and verification of solution existence. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 119(1):167–183, 2003.